

**THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL
EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN**

**SAMARKAND STATE INSTITUTE
OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES**

COURSE WORK

**THEME: SYNONYMS IN MODERN
ENGLISH**

Scientific supervisor: Qudratov L. F.

Student: Alimov U.

314-group

SAMARQAND -2016

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3-5
Chapter I. General information of synonyms in modern English	6-11
1.1 General information of synonyms in modern English.....	6
1.2 Kinds of synonyms and features.....	7
Chapter II. Different meanings and substitutions of synonym in modern English	12-21
2.1 Different meanings and substitutions of synonym in modern English.....	12
2.2 The analysis of semantic and functional relationships and words and their synonymy in modern English.....	18
CONCLUSION	22
THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE ...	23

INTRODUCTION

Teaching foreign languages in Uzbekistan has become very important since the first days of the Independence of our country, according to this our government pays much attention to the rising attention to the rising of educational level of people and their intellectual growth. As our president I.A.Karimov said: “Nowadays, foreign languages teaching system proves that educational standards, Curricula and textbooks do not fully meet the up-to-date requirements in terms of application of the advanced information and media technologies. Teaching is being conducted using traditional methodologies. The President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov highlighted the organization of a complex system of learning and teaching foreign languages in the country, focused on the upbringing of comprehensively developed, educated and intellectual young generation of people, who can meet the requirements of the time. After the Presidential Decree “On measures to further improve of foreign language learning system” (2012) a lot of projects have been done as an implementation of this important document. We can mention that from 2013/2014 academic year teaching of foreign languages, mainly English, started from the first grade of the primary school in the format of games and informal conversation lessons and since the second class schoolchildren learned the alphabet, studied grammar and developed speech skills. And regular training programs shown in the mass media are giving positive results not only in acquisition of knowledge and skills, but also in motivating Uzbek children to foreign language learning. Within these short period of time in any part of our country we can meet parents who are proud of their children speaking English.

As our President I. A. Karimov said: “Today it’s difficult to revalue the importance of knowing foreign languages for our country as our people see their great prosperous future in the cooperation with foreign partners”.

The theme of my qualification work sounds as following: “Modern synonyms in English”. This qualification work can be characterized by the following:

The actuality of this work caused by several important points. We seem to say that the problem of synonyms is one of the main difficult ones for the English language learners. It can be most clearly seen in the colloquial layer of a language, which, in its turn at high degree is supported by development of modern informational technologies and simplification of alive speech. As a result, a great number of new meanings of one and the same word appear in our vocabulary. So the significance of our work can be proved by the following reasons:

a) The problem of synonymy is one of the developing branches of vocabulary nowadays.

b) Synonymy reflects the general trend of enrichment of a language word-stock.

c) Synonymy is closely connected with the development of modern informational technologies.

d) Being a developing branch of linguistics it requires a special attention of teachers to be adequated to their specialization in English.

Having based upon the actuality of the theme we are able to formulate the general goals of our qualification work.

a) To study, analyze, and sum up all the possible changes happened in the studied branch of linguistics for the past fifty years.

b)To teach the problem of synonymy to young English learners.

c)To demonstrate the significance of the problem for those who want to brush up their English.

d)To mention all the major of linguists' opinions concerning the subject studied.

If we say about the new information used within our work we may note that the work studies the problem from the modern positions and analyzes the modern trends appeared in this subject for the last ten years. In particular, the new computer-based meanings of some habitual words were given.

The practical significance of the work can be concluded in the following items:

a)The work could serve as a good source of learning English by young teachers at schools and colleges.

b)The lexicologists could find a lot of interesting information for themselves.

c)Those who would like to communicate with the English-speaking people through the Internet will be able to use the up-to-date words with the help of our qualification work.

If we say about the methods of scientific approaches used in our work we can mention that the method of typological analysis was used.

The newality of the work is concluded in including the modern meanings of habitual words to our qualification work.

The general structure of our qualification work looks as follows:

The work is composed into three major parts: introduction, main part and conclusion. Each part has its subdivision onto the specific thematically items. There are two points in the introductory part: the first item tells about the general content of the work while the other gives us the general explanation of the lexicological phenomenon of shortening in a language.

Chapter I

1.1 GENERAL INFORMATION OF SYNONYMS IN MODERN ENGLISH

Synonyms are different words with similar or identical meanings and are interchangeable. Antonyms are words with opposite or nearly opposite meanings. (Synonym and antonym are antonyms.)

An example of synonyms is the words cat and feline. Each describes any member of the family Felidae. Similarly, if we talk about a long time or an extended time, long and extended become synonyms.

Synonyms can be nouns, adverbs or adjectives, as long as both members of the pair are the same part of speech.

More examples of English synonyms:

- baby and infant (noun)
- student and pupil (noun)
- pretty and attractive (adjective)
- sick and ill (adjective)
- interesting and fascinating (adjective)
- quickly and speedily (adverb)

Note that the synonyms are defined with respect to certain senses of words; for instance, pupil as the “aperture in the iris of the eye” is not synonymous with student. Similarly, expired as “having lost validity” (as in grocery goods) it doesn’t necessarily mean death.

Some lexicographers claim that no synonyms have exactly the same meaning (in all contexts or social levels of language) because etymology, orthography, phonic qualities, ambiguous meanings, usage, etc. make them unique. However, many people feel that the synonyms they use are identical in meaning for all practical purposes.

1.2 KINDS OF SYNONYMS AND FEATURES

Synonyms are words different in their outer aspects, but identical or similar in their inner aspects. In English there are a lot of synonyms, because there are many borrowings, e.g. hearty / native/ - cordial/ borrowing/. After a word is borrowed it undergoes desynonymization, because absolute synonyms are unnecessary for a language. However, there are some absolute synonyms in the language, which have exactly the same meaning and belong to the same style, e.g. to moan, to groan; homeland, motherland etc. In cases of desynonymization one of the absolute synonyms can specialize in its meaning and we get semantic synonyms, e.g. «city» /borrowed/, «town» /native/. The French borrowing «city» is specialized. In other cases native words can be specialized in their meanings, e.g. «stool» /native/, «chair» /French/.

Sometimes one of the absolute synonyms is specialized in its usage and we get stylistic synonyms, e.g. «to begin»/ native/, «to commence» /borrowing/. Here the French word is specialized. In some cases the native word is specialized, e.g. «welkin» /bookish/, «sky» /neutral/.

Stylistic synonyms can also appear by means of abbreviation. In most cases the abbreviated form belongs to the colloquial style, and the full form to the neutral style, e.g. «examination», «exam».

Among stylistic synonyms we can point out a special group of words which are called euphemisms. These are words used to substitute some unpleasant or offensive words, e.g. «the late» instead of «dead», «to perspire» instead of «to sweat» etc.

There are also phraseological synonyms, these words are identical in their meanings and styles but different in their combining with other words in the sentence, e.g. «to be late for a lecture» but «to miss the train», «to visit museums» but «to attend lectures» etc.

In each group of synonyms there is a word with the most general meaning, which can substitute any word in the group, e.g. «piece» is the synonymic dominant in the group «slice», «lump», «morsel». The verb «to look at» is the

synonymic dominant in the group «to stare», «to glance», «to peep». The adjective «red» is the synonymic dominant in the group «purple», «scarlet», «crimson».

When speaking about the sources of synonyms, besides desynonymization and abbreviation, we can also mention the formation of phrasal verbs, e.g. «to give up» - «to abandon», «to cut down» - «to diminish». Grouping of words is based upon similarities and contrasts and is usually called as synonymic row. Taking up similarity of meaning and contrasts of phonetic shape we observe that every language has in its vocabulary a variety of words, kindred in meaning but distinct in morphemic composition, phonemic shape and usage, ensuring the expression of the most delicate shades of thought, feeling and imagination. The more developed the language, the richer the diversity and therefore the greater the possibilities of lexical choice enhancing the effectiveness and precision of speech.

The synonymous words smash and crush are semantic-ally very close; they combine to give a forceful representation of the atrocities of war. Richness and clearness of language are of paramount importance in so far as they promote precision of thought. Even this preliminary example makes it obvious that the still very common definitions of synonyms as words of the same language having the same meaning or as different words that stand for the same notion are by no means accurate and even in a way misleading. By the very nature of language every word has its own history, its own peculiar motivation, and its own typical contexts. And besides there is always some hidden possibility of different connotation and which is feeling in each of them. Moreover, words of the same meaning would be useless for communication: they would encumber the language, not enrich it.

Synonyms can therefore be defined in terms of linguistics as two or more words of the same language, belonging to the same part of speech and possessing one or more identical or nearly identical denotational meanings, interchangeable, at least in some contexts, without any considerable alteration in denotational meaning, but differing in morphemic composition, phonemic shape, shades of meaning, connotations, affective value, style, valence and idiomatic use.

Additional characteristics of style, emotional coloring and valence peculiar to one of the elements in a synonymic group may be absent in one or all of the others.

The definition is of necessity very bulky and needs some commenting upon. By pointing out the fact that synonyms belong to the same part of speech the definition makes it clear that synonymic grouping is really a special case of lexicogrammatical grouping based on semantic proximity of words.

To have something tangible to work upon it is convenient to compare some synonyms within their group, so as to make obvious the reasons of the definition. The verbs *experience*, *undergo*, *sustain* and *suffer*, for example, come together because all four render the notion of experiencing something. The verb and the noun *experience* indicate actual living through something and coming to know it first hand rather than from hearsay. *Undergo* applies chiefly to what someone or something bears or is subjected to, as in *to undergo an operation*, *to undergo changes*. Compare also the following example from L. P. Smith: *The French language has undergone considerable and more recent changes since the date when the Normans brought it into England*. In the above example the verb *undergo* can be replaced by its synonyms without any change of the sentence meaning. This may be easily proved if a similar context is found for some other synonym in the same group. For instance: *These Latin words suffered many transformations in becoming French*.

The denotational meaning is obviously the same. Synonyms, then, are interchangeable under certain conditions specific to each group. This seems to call forth an analogy with phonological neutralization. Now, it will be remembered that neutralization is the absence in some contexts of a phonetic contrast found elsewhere or formerly in the language, as the absence of contrast between final [s] and [z] after [t]. It appears we are justified in calling semantic neutralization the suspension of an otherwise functioning semantic opposition that occurs in some lexical contexts.

Synonymic pairs like *wear and tear* are very numerous in modern English and often used both in everyday speech and in literature. They show all the typical

features of idiomatic phrases that ensure their memorability such as rhythm, alliteration, rhyme and the use of archaic words seldom occurring elsewhere.

The examples are numerous: hale and hearty, with might and main, nevertheless and notwithstanding, modes and manners, stress and strain, rack and ruin, really and truly, hue and cry, wane and pale, without let or hindrance, act and deed. There are many others which show neither rhyme nor alliteration, and consist of two words equally modern. They are pleonastic, i. e. they emphasize the idea by just stating it twice, and possess a certain rhythmical quality which probably enhances their unity and makes them easily remembered. These are: by leaps and bounds, to pick and choose, pure and simple, stuff and nonsense, bright and shining, far and away, proud and haughty and many more.

In a great number of cases the semantic difference between two OP more synonyms is supported by the difference in valence. Distributional oppositions between synonyms have never been studied systematically, although the amount of data collected is very impressive. The difference in distribution maybe syntactical, morphological, lexical, and surely deserves more attention than has been so far given to it. It is, for instance, known that bare in reference to persons is used only predicatively while naked occurs both predicatively and attributively. The same is true about alone, which, irrespectively of referent, is used only predicatively, whereas its synonyms solitary and lonely occur in both functions. The function is predicative in the following sentence: you are idle, be not solitary, if you are solitary be not idle. It has been repeatedly mentioned that begin and commence differ stylistically, it must be noted, however, that their distributional difference is not less important. Begin is generalized in its lexical meaning and becomes a semi-auxiliary when used with an infinitive. It follows naturally that begin and not commence is the right word before an infinitive even in formal style. Seem and appear may be followed by an infinitive or a that-clause. see whereas look which is stylistically equivalent to them is never used in these constructions. Aware and conscious are followed either by an o/-phrase or by a subordinate clause, e. g. to be

aware of one's failure, to be aware that one's failure is inevitable. Their synonym sensible is preferably used with an o/-phrase.

Very often the distributional difference between synonyms concerns the use of prepositions: e. g. to answer a question, but to reply to a question. The adjectives anxious and uneasy are followed by the preposition about, their synonym concerned permits a choice and is variously combined with about, at, for, with. The misuse of prepositions is one of the most common mistakes not only with foreigners but with native speakers as well.

Lexical difference in distribution is based on the difference in valence. An example of this is offered by the verbs win and gain. Both may be used in combination with the noun victory: to win a victory, to gain a victory. But with the word war only win is possible: to win a war. We are here trespassing on the domain of set expressions, a problem that has already been treated in an earlier chapter. Here it will suffice to point out that the phraseological combining possibilities of words are extremely varied.

It has been repeatedly stated that synonyms cannot be substituted into set expressions; as a general rule each synonym has its own peculiarities of phraseological connections. The statement is only approximately correct. A. V. Koenig has shown that set expressions have special properties as regards synonymy, different from those observed in free phrases. Some set expressions may vary in their lexical components without changing their meaning, e. g. cast (fling or throw] smth in smb's. teeth. Moreover, the meaning may remain unchanged even if the interchangeable components are not synonymous: to hang on by one's eyelashes (eyelids, eyebrows),-to bear or show a resemblance. The nouns glance, look and glimpse are indiscriminately used with the verbs give and have: to give a look (a glance, a glimpse), to have a look (a glance, a glimpse).

Chapter II

2.1 DIFFERENT MEANINGS AND SUBSTITUTIONS OF SYNONYMY IN MODERN ENGLISH

Since the exact meaning of each synonym is delimited by its interrelatedness with the other elements of the same group, comparison plays an important part in synonymic research. It has already been tentatively examined in the opening paragraph of this chapter; now we offer a slightly different angle of the same problem. The interchangeability and possible neutralization are tested by means of substitution, a procedure also profitably borrowed by semasiology from phonology. 1. The values of words 2. Can best be defined by substituting them for one another and observing the resulting changes. When the landlady in John Waif's "Hurry on down" says to the main personage: And where do you work? I've asked you that two or three times, Mr. Lumley, but you've never given me any answer, the verb ask has a very general meaning of seeking information. Substituting its synonyms, question or interrogate, will require a change in the structure of the sentence (the omission of that), which shows the distributional opposition between these words, and also ushers in a change in meaning. These words will heighten the implication that the landlady has her doubts about Lumley and confesses that she finds his character suspicious. The verb question would mean that she is constantly asking her lodger searching questions. The substitution of interrogate would suggest systematic and thorough questioning by a person authorized to do so; the landlady could have used it only ironically and irony would have been completely out of keeping with her mentality and habits. Observations of this sort can be supported by statistical data. Most frequent combinations such as teachers question their pupils, fudges interrogate witnesses and the like also throw light on the semantic difference between synonyms.

Synonyms have certain common ground within which they are interchangeable without alteration of meaning or with a very slight loss in effectiveness. Ask and inquire, for instance, may be used indiscriminately when not followed by any object 3 as in the following: "And where do you live now, Mr.

Gillespie?” Mrs. Pearson inquired rather archly and with her head on one side. It should be borne in mind that substitution in different contexts has for its object not only probing interchangeability but bringing into relief the difference in intellectual, emotional and stylistic value of each word. An additional procedure suggested by Ch. Bally consists in assigning to the words suitable antonyms. The difference between firm and hard, for example, is explained if we point out that firm contrasts with loose and flabby (firm ground: loose ground, firm chin : flabby chin), whereas the opposite of hard is soft (hard ground : soft ground).

The meaning of each word is conditioned the meaning of other words forming part of the same vocabulary system, and especially of those in semantic proximity. High and tall, for instance, could be defined not only from the point of view of their valence (tall is used about people) but also in relation to each other by stating how far they are interchangeable and what their respective antonyms are. A building may be high and it may be (all). High is a relative term signifying ‘greatly raised above the surface or the base’, in comparison with what is usual for objects of the same kind. A table is high if it exceeds 75 cm; a hill of a hundred meters is not high. The same relativity is characteristic of its antonym low. As to the word tall, it is used about objects whose height is greatly in excess of their breadth or diameter and whose actual height is great for an object of its kind: a tall man, a tall tree. The antonym is short.

The distinctions between words similar in meaning are often very fine and elusive, so that some special instruction on the use of synonyms is necessary even for native speakers. This accounts for the great number of books of synonyms that serve as guides for those who aim at good style and precision and wish to choose the most appropriate terms from the varied stock of the English vocabulary. The study of synonyms is especially indispensable for those who learn English as a foreign language because what is the right word in one situation will be wrong in many other, apparently similar, contexts.

It is often convenient to explain the meaning of a new word with the help of its previously learned synonym. This forms additional associations in the student’s

mind, and the new word is better remembered. Moreover, it eliminates the necessity of bringing in a native word. And yet the discrimination of synonyms and words which may be confused is more important. The teacher must show that synonyms are not identical in meaning or use and explain the difference between them by comparing and contrasting them, as well as by showing in what contexts one or the other may be most fitly used.

Translation cannot serve as a criterion of synonymy; there are cases when several English words of different distribution and valence are translated into Russian by one and the same word. Such words as also, too and as well, all translated by the Russian word *mooted*, are never interchangeable. A teacher of English should always stress the necessity of being on one's guard against mistakes of this kind.

Contextual synonyms are similar in meaning only under some specific distributional conditions. The verbs bear, suffer and stand are semantically different and not interchangeable except when used in the negative form; can't stand is equal to can't bear in the following words of an officer: Gas. I've swallowed too much of the beastly stuff: I can't stand it any longer. I'm going to the dressing-station.

There are some other distinctions to be made with respect to different kinds of semantic similarity. Some authors, for instance, class groups like ask : beg : implore or like : love : adore, gift : talent : genius as synonymous, calling them relative synonyms. This attitude is open to discussion. In fact the difference in denotative meaning is unmistakable: the words name different notions, not various degrees of the same notion, and cannot substitute one another. An entirely different type of opposition is involved. Formerly we had oppositions based on the relationships between the members of the opposition, here we deal with proportional oppositions characterized by their relationship with the whole vocabulary system and based on a different degree of intensity of the relevant distinctive features.

The majority of those who studied synonymy in the past have been cultivating both lines of approach without keeping them scrupulously apart, and focused their attention on the prominent part of foreign loan words in English synonymy, e. g. freedom : liberty or heaven : sky, where the first elements are native and the second, French and Scandinavian respectively. O. Jazzperson and many others used to stress that the English language is peculiarly rich in synonyms because Britons, Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans fighting and settling upon the soil of the British Isles could not but influence each other's speech. British scholars studied Greek and Latin and for centuries used Latin as a medium for communication on scholarly topics.

Words borrowed from Latin to interrogate abdomen to collect vacuous to complete to ascend instruction Native English words to ask belly to gather empty to end to raise teaching Synonymy has its characteristic patterns in each language. Its peculiar feature in English is the contrast between simple native words stylistically neutral, literary words borrowed from French and learned words of Greco-Latin origin. This results in a sort of stylistically conditioned triple "keyboard" that can be illustrated by the following: Words borrowed from French to question stomach to assemble devoid to finish to mount guidance English also uses many pairs of synonymous derivatives, the one Hellenic and the other Romance, e. g.: periphery : circumference: hypothesis : supposition: sympathy : compassion: synthesis : composition.

The pattern of stylistic relationship represented in the above table, although typical, is by no means universal. For example, the native words dale, deed, fair are the poetic equivalents of their much more frequent borrowed synonyms valley, act or the hybrid beautiful.

This subject of stylistic differentiation has been one of much controversy in recent years. It is universally accepted, however, that semantic and stylistic properties may change and synonyms which at one time formed a stylistic opposition only, may in the course of time become ideographically contrasted as well, and vice versa.

The role of borrowings should not be overestimated. Synonyms are also created by means of all word-forming processes productive in the language at a given time of its history. The words already existing in the language develop new meanings. New words may be formed by affixation, or loss of affixes, conversion, compounding, shortening and so on, and being coined, form synonyms to those already in use.

Of special importance for those who are interested in the present-day trends and characteristic peculiarities of the English vocabulary are the synonymic oppositions due to shift of meaning, new combinations of verbs with postpositive and compound nouns formed from them, shortenings, set expressions and conversion.

Set expressions consisting of a verb with a postpositive are widely used in present-day English and may be called one of its characteristic features. Many verbal synonymic groups contain such combinations as one of their elements. A few examples will illustrate this statement: to choose : to pick out; to abandon : to give up; to continue : to go on; to enter : to come in; to lift : to pick up; to postpone : to put off; to quarrel : to fall out; to return : to bring back. E.g. By the way, Toby has quite given up the idea of doing those animal cartoons.

The vitality of these expressions is proved by the fact that they really supply material for further word-formation. Very many compound nouns denoting abstract notions, persons and events are correlated with them, also giving ways of expressing notions hitherto named by somewhat lengthy borrowed terms. There are, for instance, such synonymic pairs as arrangement : layout; conscription : call-up; precipitation : fall-out; regeneration : feedback; reproduction : playback; resistance : fight-back; treachery : sell-out.

An even more frequent type of new formations is that in which a noun with a verbal stem is combined with a verb of generic meaning (have, give, take, get, make] into a set expression which differs from the simple verb in aspect or emphasis: to laugh: to give a laugh; to sigh: to give a sigh; to walk: to take a walk;

to smoke: to have a smoke; to love: to fall in love. E.g. now we can all have a good read with our coffee.

N. N. Amosova stresses the patterned character of the phrases in question, the regularity of connection between the structure of the phrase and the resulting semantic effect. She also points out that there may be cases when phrases of this pattern have undergone a shift of meaning and turned into phraseological units quite different in meaning from, and not synonymical with, the verbs of the same root. This is the case with to give a lift, to give somebody quite a turn, etc.

Quite frequently synonyms, mostly stylistically, but sometimes ideographic as well, are due to shortening, e. g. memorandum : memo; vegetables : vegs; margarine : merge; microphone : mike; popular (song) : pop (song).

One should not overlook the fact that conversion may also be a source of synonymy; it accounts for such pairs as commandment: ceriman, laughter : laugh. The problem in this connection is whether such cases should be regarded as synonyms or as lexical variants of one and the same word. It seems more logical to consider them, as lexical variants. . also cases of different affixation: anxiety : anxiousness, effectively ;: effectiveness, and loss of affixes: amongst ;: among or await : wait.

Essence of synonymy, synonymous relations between words have attracted and still attracts the attention of linguists, who develop the problems of semantics, since decision of the problems of synonymy is closely connected with antonym and polysemy and the studying of synonyms is important not only for semantics, but as well as for lexicography, literature studying, methodology of teaching the English language, etc.

In spite of the existence of relatively large numbers of the studies, devoted to the opening of the different sides to synonymy, hitherto there is no a unity of view in respect to determinations of the synonyms, methods of their study, principles of the separation and categorizations of the synonyms, and borders of the synonymous row.

The majority of scholars share the opinion that synonymy presents by itself the “microcircuit” of the language, which is characterized by their own relations and that it falls into quality of the component part in lexical system of the language as a whole.

Such kind of analysis of these determinations happens to in the works of Russian philologists V.A. Pautynskaya, “Review of the literature on question of the synonymy”, V.A. Zvegintsev “Semasiology”, “Questions to theories and histories of the language”, “Theoretical and applied linguistics” and V.T. Valium “About determinations of the synonymy and their synonymy in modern English.

2.2 THE ANALYSIS OF SEMANTIC AND FUNCTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS AND WORDS AND THEIR SYNONYMY IN MODERN ENGLISH

This chapter is denoted to the analysis of semantic and functional relationships and words and their synonymy in modern English. V.G. Vilyuman, in detail analyzing all signs of synonymy, comes to conclusion that necessary and sufficient for confession of the words as the synonymical ones features are general for the analyzed words semantic and functional signs, but, however, the problem of synonymy according to Volume’s opinion is being lead to the discovering of resemblances and differences of the meanings and functions of the words on the base of their combinability. This idea might be truly supported by the investigations of other linguists such as A.V.Smirnitsky and G.Khidekel.

We must also notion here that the understanding of the essence of the synonymous relations is closely connected with the understanding of the essence and structures of the semantic structure of a word. We know different ways of interpretations of the semantic structure of the word in theories of lexicology. Let us give some of these suggestions below.

V.G. Viluman defines the semantic structure of the word as a set of semantic signs, which are revealed at the determination of semantic adjacency of the synonymical words. According to his opinion, one of the possible ways of the

determination of semantic adequacy of the words is offered by the analysis of the description of meanings for these words in explanatory dictionaries. Two words are considered as semantically correspondent to each other if their vocabulary meaning is explained one through another. The relationship between two words can also be direct and mediated. For example, having studied the semantic relationship between verbs which are united by the semantic meaning of “to look”, V.G. Vilyuman builds the matrix of the semantic structures of the synonymical verbs analyzed. The matrix presentation of the semantic structures serves not only as a demonstrative depiction of the material, but it also creates the picture a unit systems in a language - we mean synonymy, since the semantic structure of each word in the matrix is represented by itself as a ranked ensemble of importance's interconnected and opposed to each other.

The deep penetration to the essence of language phenomena, their nature and laws of the development is promoted by the collation of these phenomena in two and more languages.

The problems of the comparative study of lexicon in different languages have found their reflected images in the works of such kind famous lexicologists as A.V. Scherba, R.A. Budagov, V.G. Gak, B.A. Uspensky, V.N. Yartseva, Sh. Balley, S. Uliman, U. Veinrich, A.V.Smirnitsky and the others.¹

Many linguists consider as expedient to match the small systems between themselves, the members of which are semantically bound between itself. This enables us to define the lexical elements of each system by means of investigation, and to note the moments of the coincidences between them, as well as to explain why the semantic sidebars of each word or words, which have the alike subject reference in compared languages, are turned out to be different.

The comparative studies also serve as the base for typological investigations, the production of typological universals, since, as a result of such correspondences, are identically and non-identically fixed with the determined standpoint elements.

For example, the Russian linguist M.M. Makovskiy in his article “Typology of Lexical-Semantic Systems” emphasizes that the typological analysis of lexicon

must not only be reduced to the external, mostly available establishments, which are often available for observation, but often casual in coincidences in their lexical and semantically meanings. In the course of studies we must necessary realize, if there general structured lexical-semantic models, common for many languages (Russian and Uzbek are included) exist, and if yes, what kind of peculiarities and laws are observed for this.

Thereby, we see that the problem of synonymy was studied and is being studied, but, regrettably, the majority of the studies in this area belong to the foreign lexicologists, especially by the Russian ones. In Uzbekistan the studding of the problem of synonymy is investigated by a relatively small quantity of lexicologists, except for Prof. Buranov and Prof. Muminov.

The following chapter of my qualification work studies the verbal synonymy, which is one of the most fewly studied problems concerned with linguistics at all and the problems of synonymy in particular.

Considering the semantic generality of the lexical units and their partial interchangeability as the features of synonyms, that is to say, the compatibility of words in one contextual meaning and the inconsistency in others, we hereunder may confirm that two words interchangeable in all contexts are not synonyms, because when two words are used with no difference, there is no a problem of the choice between them. Now let us analyze this problem from the viewpoint of the Russian scholar S. Ulman. Citing on Aristotel, S. Uliman emphasizes that synonymy of the words - a stylistic category and the style always expects the choice between two words, at least, which are compatible or incompatible. Hence it follows that where there are no grounds for choice between two or more words, there are no grounds for speaking about synonymy of these words.

Amongst the judgments about correlation of meanings in synonymy and their interchangeable character, there are such, which reduce the synonymy to unlimited interchange. For instance, A. Cherch writes that if two names (the question is about the names presented as combinations of the words) are synonyms (that is they have one and the same content), it is always possible for a linguist to

change one of them into another. However, example, which A. Cherch gives on this cause, shows that the interchangeable character of synonyms is limited. This example looks as follows:

e.g. Sir Valiter Scott is the author of “Veverley”

In this example we can see that though Sir Walter Scott is not a Veverley by its semantic content but Sir Walter Scott is Sir Walter Scott, though when we say a word “Veverley” we may mention Walter Scott as the author of the former.

In the linguistic literature on synonymy we can read that the interchangeable character of lexical units is considered as the effect to generalities of their lexical and grammatical importance. For support of this idea we can take the works of A.L. Demidova, who, concerning with synonymical pretext, comes to conclusion that some synonyms differ in their semantically meaning and cannot be interchanged to each other, while the others are of stylistic shade and can be interchanged into each other. I agree with A.L. Demidova’s idea is that there also exists the third group of synonyms, which combines in itself the features of the first two previous groups. And, consequently, such synonyms are interchangeable in one case and not interchangeable in another.

According to concepts accepted by me , the synonymy exists only under the two above mentioned conditions of semantic generality, while the words which correspond only to one of these conditions, are not of synonymic character.

CONCLUSION

So, the conclusion is that some words of a language don't lend themselves well to the analysis in terms of semantic fields. Other important idea is the difficulty of finding finite sets of words. In any case, there's an internal contradiction between the ideas of a set with the structuring of words of a language. A set is a close set. A word can belong to several fields depending on the organizing concept. Speakers of the language clearly identify the central example but not the peripheral ones. This doesn't mean that it would never happen that. The degree of flexibility in the discrepancy of the categorization of words is smaller.

Ex: Please give me some more tables ('Table' is here a mass noun meaning 'space in a table').

E.G. Two races are grown in India. Here two races' refers to 'two types of rice'

The idea behind this is that the dynamic character of a vocabulary cannot be reflected in the static character of the semantic fields, which are a static way of organizing the vocabulary of a language.

Having analyzed the problem of synonymy in Modern English we could do the following conclusions:

- a) The problem of synonymy in Modern English is very actual nowadays.
- b) There are several kinds of analysis of synonyms: semantical, stylistic and componentional.
- d) The problem of synonymy is still waits for its detail investigation.

Having said about the perspectives of the work we hope that this work will find its worthy way of applying at schools, lyceums and colleges of high education by both teachers and students of English. We also express our hopes to take this work its worthy place among the lexicological works dedicated to synonymy.

THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. The decree of the President of Uzbekistan I. A. Karimov № 1875 “On measures to further improve of foreign language learning system”,
2. December, 10, 2012. Karimov I. A. (1997) “Harmoniously developed generation is the basis of progress of Uzbekistan. Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 1997.
3. Abayev V.I. Synonyms and their Semantical Features T. O’qituvchi 1981 pp. 4-5, 8, 26-29
4. Arnold I.V. The English Word M. High School 1986 pp. 143-149
5. Buranov A. Muminov J. Readings on Modern English Lexicology T. O’qituvchi 1985 pp. 34-47
6. Dubenets E.M. Modern English Lexicology (Course of Lectures)
7. Jespersen ,Otto. Growth and Structure of the English Language. Oxford, 1982 pp.246-249
8. M., Moscow State Teacher Training University Publishers 2004 pp.17-31
9. O. Jespersen. Linguistics. London, 1983, pp. 395-412
10. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. Oxford 1964., pp.147, 167, 171-172
11. V.D. Arakin English Russian Dictionary M., Russky Yazyka

Internet recourses

12. Internet: <http://www.wikipedia.com/English/articles/synonyms.htm>
13. Internet: http://www.mpsttu.ru/works/english_philology/ Э. М. Дубенец. Курс лекций и планы семинарских занятий по лексикологии английского языка.htm
14. Internet: <http://www.freeessays.com/english/E.Cruse> Quantiitive and Qualitive synonymy.htm
